UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,371	07/08/2003	Maryann Walsh Wolff	P0659-7000.10	1224

37462   7590   03/10/2008

LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
ONE MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142

EXAMINER
CARTER, CANDICE D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/10/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@ll-a.com
gengelson@ll-a.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _08 July 2003_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-33_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-33_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _08 July 2003_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _12/1/2003_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This communication is a First Action Non-Final on the merits. Claims 1-33, as

originally filed, are currently pending and have been considered below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of
> making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the
> art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall
> set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3.   Claims 8 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing

to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the

invention. The mention of specifying a confidence factor for respective tasks is not

described in the spec in such a way as to enable a person having ordinary skill in the

pertinent art accomplish this task. It is unclear how the confidence factors are

determined. The disclosure lacks direction in how to properly define and assign

confidence factors to the plurality of tasks. The claims are indefinite as a proper

definition of the term confidence factor has not been provided in the disclosure of this

application making it impossible to complete the step as recited. The concept of

defining confidence factors is not necessitated by the prior art and one skilled in the art

would be unable to know how to complete this step.

4.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5.   **Claims 2 and 11-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Claim 2 recites the limitation "providing a set of set of default templates comprises a step of selecting a set of templates from among a plurality sets of default templates". It is unclear what set of templates is being selected if only a single set of templates has been provided. Appropriate Clarification is required.

Claims 2 and 11-13 recite the limitation "default templates". It is unclear what the Applicant's intended meaning for the limitation in this claim is. Appropriate clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7.   **Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 10, 15, 19, 20, 28, 29, 30, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gundewar et al. (6,381,610).**

As per claim 1, Gundewar et al. discloses "A method of managing a project, comprising steps of.

providing a set of templates, each of the templates corresponding to respective tasks of the project to be performed" (col. 2, line 2 discloses templates associated with project tasks);

"performing steps of the project in accordance with the templates" (col. 4, line 48 – col. 5, line 44 discloses project tasks templates used to execute procedures related to the particular processes of the project);

"and recording information specified in the templates, during the project" (col. 7, line 10 discloses templates that are to be filled out during the project).

Claims 10 and 33 recite equivalent limitations to claim 1 and are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as set forth above.

As per claim 3, Gundewar et al. discloses "substantially all of the project is performed using the templates" (col. 4, line 48 – col. 5, line 44 discloses project task templates used to execute procedures related to the particular processes of the project)

As per claim 4, Gundewar et al. discloses "the project includes a step of planning development of a good to be sold commercially" (col. 1, line 10-11 discloses development of computer software, where computer software is sold commercially).

As per claim 5, Gundewar et al. discloses "the project includes a step of implementing an information technology project within an organization" (col. 1, line 10-11 discloses design projects such as the development of computer software, where the design project developing computer software is an information technology project).

As per claim 9, Gundewar et al. discloses "the step of recording comprises a step of storing the information in a field of the template" (col. 2, line 20 discloses a template having data fields to be completed by a user).

As per claim 15, Gundewar et al. discloses "the using step comprises a step of automatically suggesting content for one or more deliverables identified in at least one of the templates" (col. 5, line 51-53 discloses a list of necessary inputs, a list of outputs and/or deliverables and entry and exit criteria).

As per claim 19, Gundewar et al. discloses "the using step comprises steps of:

retrieving information for a group of the tasks" (col. 6, line 8 discloses that a user can review inputs by looking at completed templates);

"and identifying areas of risk for the project, based on the retrieved information (col. 7, line 23-25 discloses team members may be required to complete a risk evaluation to ensure adequate coverage of risk assessment in all aspects of the project implementation, where it is inherent that team members must use information about the project tasks in order to complete a thorough risk assessment of the projects).

As per claim 20, Gundewar et al. discloses "generating step comprises a step of identifying proof points for a plurality of the tasks" (col. 6, line 56-60 discloses that the guidelines associated with filling out templates should include additional standards, documentation, quality assurance, where the additional standards, quality assurance, and documentation are proof points).

As per claim 28, Gundewar et al. discloses "electronically recording feedback information for future projects" (col. 8, line 54-60 discloses electronically submitting risk assessment feedback from project team members)

As per claim 29, Gundewar et al. discloses "linking feedback information to one or more of the templates" (col. 7. line 35-43 discloses a project repository module collating and summarizing responses to risk assessment feedback, where this feedback is added to the project workspace that is linked to all other templates for the project)

As per claim 30, Gundewar et al. discloses "generating step comprises a step of linking respective reference material to each of a plurality of the templates" (col. 6, line 45 discloses links or selectable references to particular corporate industry policies or standards from policy and standard database associated with the particular process).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9.   **Claims 2, 11-13, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. in view of Lower et al. (2001).**

As per claim 2, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the step of providing a set of templates comprises a step of selecting a set of templates from among a plurality of sets of default templates".

Lower et al. discloses managing projects with Microsoft Project 2000 using "the step of providing a set of templates comprises a step of selecting a set of templates from among a plurality of sets of default templates" (pg. 377, Create a Project Based on a Microsoft Project Template discloses a list of a plurality of predefined or default templates designed for different industries and efforts).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the set of default templates as taught by Microsoft in order to allow users to select a template that is tailored to a specific type of project.

As per claim 11, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the generating step comprises steps of providing default templates "and modifying the default templates to customize them for the project".

Lower et al. discloses managing projects with Microsoft Project 2000 having a "generating step comprises steps of providing default templates" (pg. 377, Create a Project Based on a Microsoft Project Template discloses a list of a plurality of predefined or default templates designed for different industries and efforts);

"and modifying the default templates to customize them for the project" (pg. 376 discloses that you can either create your own project template or adapt/modify one of the predefined/default templates that comes with Microsoft Project).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the step of providing default templates and modifying the default templates to customize them for the project as taught by Microsoft in order to allow users to select a template that is tailored to a specific type of project and to allow them to modify the default template with information specific to the particular project that they are working on.

As per claim 12, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the step of modifying comprises steps of retrieving information from previously completed projects and using the retrieved information to determine modifications to the default templates".

Lower et al. discloses managing projects with Microsoft Project 2000 having "the step of modifying comprises steps of retrieving information from previously completed projects and using the retrieved information to determine modifications to the default templates" (pg. 376, Create a Project Template discloses creating a template after you've finished a project as a way of capturing valuable historical data, where this information may be used to modify the default templates as described).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the steps of retrieving information from previously completed projects and using the retrieved information to determine

modifications to the default templates in order to facilitate the creation of templates by utilizing historical information regarding similar past projects.

As per claim 13, the Gundewar et al. and Microsoft combination discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the step of modifying further comprises a step of automatically modifying default templates based on performance in past projects".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to automatically modify default templates, since it has been held that broadly providing a mechanical or automatic means to replace manual activity which has accomplished the same result involves only routine skill in the art.

As per claim 21, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the generating step comprises a step of assigning dependency links among the tasks".

Lower et al. discloses managing projects with Microsoft Project 2000 having "the generating step comprises a step of assigning dependency links among the tasks" (pg. 58, Building your Schedule Using Task Dependencies discloses specify dependencies between tasks).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include assignment of dependency links among tasks as taught by Lower et al. in order to identify those tasks that are dependent upon other tasks in the project.

As per claim 22, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the using step comprises a step of automatically updating templates based on changes to information in tasks that are identified in the dependency links"

Lower et al. discloses managing projects with Microsoft Project 2000 having "the using step comprises a step of automatically updating templates based on changes to information in tasks that are identified in the dependency links" (pg. 59, ¶ 4 discloses automatically recalculating the finish date of a successor task when the finish date of a predecessor task is pushed back).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the automatic updating of templates based on changes to information in tasks that are identified in the dependency links as taught by Lower et al. since such would ensure that any changes in the project schedule will be reflected in all tasks that are affected.

As per claim 23, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the dependency link identifies a successor task".

Lower et al. discloses managing projects with Microsoft Project 2000 having "the dependency link identifying a successor task (pg. 59, ¶ 4 discloses identify a task dependency that has a successor task).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing

project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the identification of a successor task as

taught by Lower et al. since such would facilitate the updating of tasks and project

schedules.

As per claim 24, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed

invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the dependency link identifies a successor task".

Lower et al. discloses managing projects with Microsoft Project 2000 having "the

dependency link identifying a predecessor task (pg. 59, ¶ 1 discloses identify the

predecessors for a task).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art

at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing

project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the identification of a predecessor task

as taught by Lower et al. since such would facilitate the updating of tasks and project

schedules.

10.   **Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable**

over Gundewar et al. in view of Borton (2001/0047274).

As per claim 6, Gundewar et al. discloses "the performing step includes a step of

designing a product" (col. 1, line 10-11 discloses design projects such as the

development of computer software, where there, inherently, is a step of designing a

product in a project for designing a computer software).

Gundewar et al, however, fails to explicitly disclose "one or more of the templates

is populated with design information in advance of performing the design step"

Borton discloses activity based business modeling having templates that are pre populated with information (¶ 46 discloses where certain data for the model is unknown, a user can use pre populated templates with typical data, where if a template is pre populated, it is populated before completing any other steps with regard to that template).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the pre populated template as taught by Borton in order to have pertinent design information available before performing any actions related to the design of the product.

As per claim 7, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the step of providing a set of templates comprises a step of providing templates pre populated with information for use in the project".

Borton discloses activity based business modeling having templates that are pre populated with information (¶ 46 discloses where certain data for the model is unknown, a user can use pre populated templates with typical data, where if a template is pre populated, it is populated before completing any other steps with regard to that template).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the pre populated template as taught

by Borton in order to have pertinent information available before performing any actions related to the project task.

11.   **Claims 8, 16-18, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. in view of Kaufer et al. (6, 519, 763).**

As per claim 8, Gundewar discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "one or more of the templates includes information specifying a confidence factor for a respective activity for the template".

Kaufer et al. discloses a time management and task completion and prediction software specifying a confidence factor for a respective activity (col. 9, line 55 discloses task confidence levels, where the confidence levels are confidence factors).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the confidence levels as taught by Kaufer et al. in order to monitor task completions.

As per claim 16 Gundewar discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the generating step comprises a step of assigning a confidence factor to each of a plurality of the tasks".

Kaufer et al. discloses a time management and task completion and prediction software assigning a confidence factor to each of a plurality of the tasks (col. 9, line 55 discloses task confidence levels, where the confidence levels are confidence factors).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing

project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the confidence levels as taught by

Kaufer et al. in order to monitor task completions.

As per claim 17 Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed

invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the using step comprises a step of modifying

one of the confidence factors during performance of its respective task".

Kaufer et al. discloses a time management and task completion and prediction

software having a "step of modifying one of the confidence factors during performance

of its respective task" (col. 18, line 28-40 discloses time completion for a project is

increased or decreased from the total duration as delays in the project occur, the new

confidence data is then fitted to a prediction curve and a new confidence level is then

assigned to the task completion).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art

at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing

project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the modification of confidence factors

during performance of its respective task since such would ensure the predicted task

completions are updated as needed.

As per claim 18, the Gundewar et al. and Kaufer et al. combination discloses all

of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "determining an

aggregated confidence factor, based on confidence factors of a plurality of tasks".

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time

the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project

procedures of the Gundewar et al. Kaufer et al. combination to include the aggregation

of confidence factors because it is old and well known to sum together similar values or terms.

As per claim 31, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "assigning a respective automated alert criterion to each of a plurality of the tasks"

Kaufer et al. discloses a time management and task completion and prediction software "assigning a respective automated alert criterion to each of a plurality of tasks" (col.5, line 38-51 discloses alerts are utilized by the system as a mechanism for notifying team members when there are potential problems with the project, such as when deadlines have not been met or task completion is projected to delay the given project completion schedule, where the criterion includes deadlines not being met and task completion delays).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the alert criterion as taught by Kaufer et al. in order to ensure that all team members will be aware of any delays or problems that may occur during the course of the project.

12.   **Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. in view of Smith et al. (6,609,100).**

As per claim 14, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the generating step comprises the step of providing question and answer prompts to assist in completing one or more tasks"

Smith et al. discloses a program planning management system providing question and answer prompts (claim 11 discloses prompting a user regarding editing and to allow the user, by answering said questions displayed in display screen, to define and edit attributes).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the question and answer prompts as taught by Smith et al. since such would facilitate the construction of templates for use in the project.

13.   **Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. in view of Ahamparam et al. (2003/0135399).**

As per claim 25, Gundewar discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "the generating step comprises a step of identifying success factors for each of a plurality of the tasks".

Ahamparam et al. discloses a system and method for project optimization having a step of identifying "success factors for each of a plurality of tasks" (¶ 41 disclose identifies front end critical success factors).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the identification of success factors as taught by Ahamparam et al. in order to identify and monitor areas of risk.

As per claim 26, Gundewar et al. discloses all of the elements of the claimed

invention but fails to explicitly disclose "evaluating the success factors for each of a

plurality of the tasks".

Ahamparam et al. discloses a system and method for project optimization having

a step of "evaluating the success factors for each of a plurality of the tasks" (¶ 42

discloses benchmarking risks/success factors against the industry best in class scores

to offer a more accurate prediction of the project's success, where the benchmarking is

an evaluation).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art

at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing

project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the evaluation of success factors as

taught by Ahamparam et al. in order to be aware the status of the risks and success

factors associated with risks.

As per claim 27, Gundewar et al. discloses "initiating actions in response to

submission of a template" (col. 8, line 50-53).

Gundewar et al., however, fails to explicitly disclose "evaluating a success factor

for a task". Ahamparam et al. discloses a system and method for project optimization

having a step of "evaluating the success factors for each of a plurality of the tasks" (¶ 42

discloses benchmarking risks/success factors against the industry best in class scores

to offer a more accurate prediction of the project's success, where the benchmarking is

an evaluation).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include the evaluation of success factors as taught by Ahamparam et al. in order to be aware the status of the risks and success factors associated with them.

14.   **Claims 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gundewar et al. in view of Examiner's Official Notice.**

As per claim 32, Gundewar discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention but fails to explicitly disclose "each of the templates has the same format".

Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known to use templates having the same format. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made to modify the system and method for implementing project procedures of Gundewar et al. to include templates having the same format in order to eliminate the risk of having compatibility issues between the templates.

Conclusion

1.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Young et al. (7,058,588) discloses a dependency based work flow integration and reduction system. Miller (6,101,481) discloses a task management system. Desjardins (2002/0059512) discloses a method and system for managing an information technology project.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CANDICE D. CARTER whose telephone number is (571) 270-5105. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:30am- 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CDC

/John G. Weiss/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629